

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF OREGON**

**RACHEL MARIE ELDRIDGE, and
CATHERINE BETTY JEAN
HOAGLAND,**

Plaintiffs,

v.

**HOME FORWARD; IRVINE
MATTHEWS; ROBERT; ANNA; and
ANGEL,**

Defendants.

Case No. 3:24-cv-00305-JR

ORDER

IMMERGUT, District Judge.

No objections to Judge Russo’s Findings and Recommendation (“F&R”), ECF 5, have been filed. For the following reasons, the Court ADOPTS the F&R.

STANDARDS

Under the Federal Magistrates Act (“Act”), as amended, the court may “accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.”

28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). If a party objects to a magistrate judge’s F&R, “the court shall make a de novo determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or

recommendations to which objection is made.” *Id.* But the court is not required to review, de novo or under any other standard, the factual or legal conclusions of the F&R that are not objected to. *See Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149–50 (1985); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc). Nevertheless, the Act “does not preclude further review by the district judge, *sua sponte*” whether de novo or under another standard. *Thomas*, 474 U.S. at 154.

CONCLUSION

Judge Russo’s F&R, ECF 5, is adopted in full. This Court DISMISSES this action with prejudice for failure to prosecute and failure to follow a court order.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED this 8th day of April, 2024.

/s/ Karin J. Immergut
Karin J. Immergut
United States District Judge